

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/626,811	10/626,811 07/23/2003		Anthony David Auffret	PC25042A	2538
28523	7590	09/21/2004		EXAMINER	
PFIZER IN		ENT, MS8260-	HENRY, MICHAEL C		
EASTERN			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
GROTON,	CT 0634	0		1623	
				DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-		Appl	lication No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary			526,811	AUFFRET ET AL				
			miner	Art Unit				
		Mich	ael C. Henry	1623	+ .			
The MAILING Period for Reply	G DATE of this communic	cation appears o	on the cover sheet	with the correspondence ac	ddress			
THE MAILING DAT - Extensions of time may lafter SIX (6) MONTHS fr - If the period for reply spe - If NO period for reply is service to reply within the Any reply received by the		CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In unication. of days, a reply within the trutory period will apply will, by statute, cause the	n no event, however, may he statutory minimum of t and will expire SIX (6) Mi he application to become	a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered time ONTHS from the mailing date of this of ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) Responsive t	to communication(s) filed	d on						
2a) ☐ This action is		b)⊠ This action	ı is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-29</u> 4a) Of the abo 5)□ Claim(s) <u></u>	g is/are pending in the ap ove claim(s) is/are	e withdrawn fron to.						
Application Papers								
9)☐ The specificat	tion is objected to by the	Examiner.						
•	s) filed on is/are: a		or b)□ objected to	o by the Examiner.				
				ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement d	drawing sheet(s) including th	he correction is re	equired if the drawin	ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CF ed Office Action or form PT	* *			
Priority under 35 U.S.0	C. § 119				•			
a) Acknowledgme a) All b) S 1. Certified 2. Certified 3. Copies applicat	ent is made of a claim for some * c) None of: d copies of the priority do d copies of the priority do	ocuments have ocuments have the priority doc al Bureau (PCT	been received. been received in suments have been Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National	Stage			
				f · ·				
A44-ah4/a\								
Attachment(s) 1) ⊠ Notice of References C)Hod (DTO 802)		4) 🖂 Interview	. O				
2) 🔲 Notice of Draftsperson's	's Patent Drawing Review (PTC Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT		Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO)-152)			

Art Unit: 1623

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-29 are pending in application

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed complies with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. It has been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Claim Objections

Claims 7 and 11-29 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only and/or cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 7 and 11-29 have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mori et al. (DE 2737947, Abstract Only).

Art Unit: 1623

In claim 1, applicant claims "A process for preparing a dosage form, which affords a low viscosity solution when placed in the mouth of the consumer, which process comprises the steps of

- (a) preparing a hydrated polymer composition comprising pullulan and sodium alginate having a viscosity suitable for casting;
- (b) casting said composition into the shape of a dosage form; and
- (c) drying said dosage form under such conditions as to provide a form which rapidly dissolves and disperses in the mouth of the consumer."

Mori et al. disclose applicant's process for preparing a film comprising pullulan and sodium alginate, which process comprises (a) preparing a solution polymer composition comprising pullulan and sodium alginate having a viscosity suitable for casting; (b) casting said composition into the shape of a film (a dosage form); and (c) drying said film (dosage form) (see abstract). It should be noted that although Mori et al. is silent about the properties or characteristics of the form which pertains to its ability to rapidly dissolve and disperse in the mouth of a consumer, Mori et al.'s composition is the same as applicant's composition (which also comprises pullulan and sodium alginate) and is prepared by the same method, and consequently should inherently possess the same properties.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

⁽a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 1623

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leung et al. (WO 00/18365).

In claim 1, applicant claims "A process for preparing a dosage form, which affords a low viscosity solution when placed in the mouth of the consumer, which process comprises the steps of

- (a) preparing a hydrated polymer composition comprising pullulan and sodium alginate having a viscosity suitable for casting;
- (b) casting said composition into the shape of a dosage form; and
- (c) drying said dosage form under such conditions as to provide a form which rapidly dissolves and disperses in the mouth of the consumer."

Leung et al. disclose a process for preparing a physiologically consumable film (a dosage form), which process comprises the

- (a) preparing a hydrated polymer composition comprising pullulan suitable for casting;
- (b) casting said composition into the shape of a film (dosage form); and
- (c) drying said dosage form to provide a form which dissolves and in the mouth of a consumer (see examples, page 31, line 11 to page 31, line 12; see also claims 18, 29 and 30). In addition, Leung et al. disclose that their composition can contain mixtures of water soluble film formers such as pullulan and sodium alginate (see claim 29).

The difference between the applicant's claimed method and the method of Leung et al. is that Leung et al. do not specifically exemplify the use of sodium alginate together with pullulan

Art Unit: 1623

in their preparation. However, Leung et al. disclose that their composition can contain mixtures of the water soluble film formers, pullulan and sodium alginate (see claim 29).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed invention was made, to have used the method of Leung et al., to prepare a composition comprising pullulan and sodium alginate to be used for oral consumption, since Leung et al. disclose that pullulan and sodium alginate can be combined to form a physiologically consumable film.

One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the method of Leung et al., to prepare a composition comprising pullulan and sodium alginate to be used for oral consumption, since Leung et al. disclose that pullulan and sodium alginate can be combined to form a physiologically consumable film. Dependent claims 2-6 which are drawn to said method wherein the composition also comprises one or more pharmaceutically active agents and the composition is adjusted to specific pH range with specific acids including citric acid, are also encompassed by this rejection since Leung et al. disclose the use of a pharmaceutically active agent (an antimicrobial) in the composition and disclose the use the citric acid in the composition (see claims 1 and example 19, page 43, line 21). Furthermore, although Leung et al. do not disclose the pH of their composition, the adjustment of the pH is a matter of choice and does not appear to affect the composition formed. Dependent claim 8 which is drawn to the process of claim 1 wherein the composition also contains one or both of the enzymes pullulanase and alginate lyase, is also rejected as been obvious over Mori et al., since it is common and obvious to use or add enzymes that specifically catalyze the breakdown of substrates (such as pullulan and alignate) that are constituents of consumable compositions as to facilitate the digestion of

Art Unit: 1623

said substrates. Dependent claims 9 and 10 which is drawn to the process of claim 1 wherein the composition or dosage form is irradiated with gamma-radiation at specific amounts, are also rejected as been obvious over Mori et al., since gamma irradiation is commonly applied in processing or sterilization of foods, consumables and the like.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Henry whose telephone number is 571-272-0652. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am to 5:00 pm; Mon-Fri. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-1235.

MCH

September 17, 2004.

SAMUEL BARTS PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1200